

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 12, and 20-21 are amended. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-23 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections 35 U. S. C. § 112

Claims 1-3 and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 1 is amended, in a non-limiting way, to better describe the claimed features. Claim 1 now recites “sorting means for sorting a packet according to whether the packet should be transmitted in a unicast form or in a simultaneous packet form by multicast or broadcast,” and “packet identification information addition means for adding packet identification information to the packet if the packet is sorted as a packet to be transmitted in the simultaneous packet form by the sorting means”.

Support for claim 1 can be found in Figure 1 and the Specification, for example on Page 10/Lines 3-11, and Page 10/Lines 11-19. Emphasis Added.

“The base station 100 includes a wireless zone transmission packet sorting section 130, and a redundant packet addition section 140. The wireless zone transmission packet sorting section 130 determines, if a packet acquired from a higher network 10 through a transmission and reception section 110 and a bridge section 120 or a packet acquired from a wireless zone through a wireless transmission and reception section 160 and the bridge section 120 is transmitted to the terminal 200 (or a plurality of terminals 200 to 20x), whether to transmit the packet in a simultaneous packet form by multicast or broadcast or in a unicast form.”

“If the sorting section 130 has determined that the packet should be transmitted in the simultaneous packet form, then the redundant packet addition section 140 acquires a new sequence number obtained by increasing the sequence number stored in a transmission sequence number storage section 150, and transmits both a simultaneous packet including the new sequence number as well as a LAN packet or a higher level packet and a redundant packet which is a duplicate of the simultaneous packet to the wireless zone through the wireless transmission and reception section 160.”

The above amendments should remove the 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections 35 U. S. C. § 102

(I) Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11

Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,089,304 to Graham (hereinafter “Graham”).

As explained above, claim 1 is amended to recite “sorting means for sorting a packet according to whether the packet should be transmitted in a unicast form or in a simultaneous packet form by multicast or broadcast,” and “packet identification information addition means for adding packet identification information to the packet if the packet is sorted as a packet to be transmitted in the simultaneous packet form by the sorting means”. It is respectfully submitted that a system that is able to process packets in this way is not taught in the cited prior art.

Graham teaches to determine if usage tracking is enabled for a client. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Graham that the packet should be sorted according to whether the packet should be transmitted in a unicast form or in a simultaneous packet form by multicast or broadcast. Graham also fails to teach or suggest “packet identification information addition means for adding packet identification information to the packet if the packet is sorted as a packet to be transmitted in the simultaneous packet form by the sorting means”.

Thus, Graham fails to disclose all of the recited features of claim 1. If this rejection is maintained, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where these features can be found in Graham.

Claim 5, 9, and 11 depend from claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons.

(II) Claims 12, 14, 18 and 21

Claims 12, 14, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,574,770 to Daudelin et al. (hereinafter “Daudelin”).

Claim 12 is amended to recite “sorting means for sorting the received packets according to whether each of the received packets is a simultaneous packet or a unicast packet, and, if the received packet is a simultaneous packet, further sorting the received packet according to whether the simultaneous packet is allocated packet identification information.” Support for claim 12 can be found in Figure 3 and the Specification, for example, in the Paragraph starting at Page 12/Line 9. No new matter is added.

Daudelin is directed towards a communication system in which each transmitting endpoint transmits its packets into a distinct queue, where “no other packets are transmitted until a transmit complete signal is generated” by the receiving endpoint and received by the transmitting endpoint. However, Daudelin *fails* to teach “sorting means for sorting the received packets according to whether each of the received packets is a simultaneous packet or a unicast packet, and, if the received packet is a simultaneous packet, further sorting the received packet according to whether the simultaneous packet is allocated packet identification information.”

Thus, Daudelin *fails* to disclose all of the recited features of claim 12. If this rejection is maintained, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where these features can be found in Daudelin.

Claims 14, 18, and 21 depend from claim 12, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections 35 U. S. C. § 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of U.S. Patent 6,032,197 to Birdwell et al. (hereinafter “Birdwell”). Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of U.S. Patent 6,112,323 to Meizlik et al. (hereinafter “Meizlik”). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of U.S. Patent 6,188,691 to Barkai et al. (hereinafter “Barkai”). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Barkai and further in view of Meizlik. Claim 10 is rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of U.S. Patent 6,577,609 to Sharony (hereinafter "Sharony"). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daudelin in view of Birdwell. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daudelin in view of U.S. Patent 6,574,770 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daudelin in view of Barkai. Claims 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daudelin in view of U.S. Patent 6,646,987 to Qaddoura (hereinafter "Qaddoura"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daudelin in view of Sharony. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daudelin in view of Qaddoura and further in view of Sharony.

Birdwell, Meizlik, Barkai, Sharony, Chen and Qaddoura have been utilized to teach features of the dependent claims not taught by either Graham or Daudelin, but fail to cure the deficiencies of Graham and Daudelin explained above.

Thus, the 103 rejections of above claims are now moot for at least the above explained reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith,

Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 18, 2008

By Phillip J. Antuola *Reg. No.*
38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

for / George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,072